

Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of PLANNING BOARD P.O. Box 729 827 Ph. 369-9702 Fax 369-4521

CARLISLE EDUCATION CENTER 872 WESTFORD ST.

MINUTES: FEB. 7, 1994

Chair Ernstoff opened the meeting at 8:10. Present were Hughes, Colman, Chaput and Yanofsky. The minutes of Dec. 6, 1993 and the Jan. 10, 1994 Hamilton special permit hearing, as amended, and the minutes of the Jan. 10, 1994 Senkler and Boiteau special permit hearings and the Jan. 10, 1994 meeting, as written, were unanimously accepted on a motion by Colman, seconded by Hughes.

Bills were approved for payment as presented.

Budget and Fincom Meeting Discussion: In general, Colman said, the sense of concern on the part of the Fincom is driven by the need to avoid an override. Colman explained that, at their meeting of Jan. 27, they requested the board return with more information about the proposed budget in three areas. First, they questioned whether any money spent on the Master Plan was useful, and asked that the board substantiate the need for the \$1500 requested for '94-95. Second, they asked how much the board can expect to bring in from subdivision fees. Third, they asked that the P.A. show the per cent of her hours spent in each of three areas: general office work, regulatory work, and master plan work. In discussing these requests, the Fincom told Colman that in previous years they had been told the M.P. could be done in one or two years, with an expenditure of about \$500 each year. Board members agreed that the Fincom may not understand the requirement for the Master Plan, or the fact that a Master Plan is a process which once initially complete, needs updating, and may not remember that the board had been instructed by town meeting '93 to be more inclusive in its process. Inclusivity, Colman, Yanofsky and Ernstoff will explain to the Fincom on the appointed night, takes time and money. The board discussed Yanofsky and Duscha's report detailing the work to be done throughout 1994, with a completion date of town meeting '95. There was some agreement on the general direction of the Yanofsky/Duscha report, it will be discussed further at the meeting of Feb. 14. Yanofsky will provide a break down of expenses covered in the \$1500 Master Plan budget request. Colman also reported that Chair of Selectmen Nei expressed her concern to him that the Planning Board is so involved with the slow Master Plan process that it won't be able to give input to the Selectmen on the town hall site selection process, the final product of which will go to town meeting this year. Board members agreed that it is too soon to make a recommendation, but they constructed a set of standards whereby they would judge the alternative sites. (The standards are attached to these minutes.) Ernstoff, and any other board members who are available, will attend the

Selectmen's meeting on Feb. 8 to hear the report to be made by the Selectmen's subcommittee.

Finally, members agreed to begin a draft of the M.P. report to be presented to the town meeting. Chaput will have a first draft by Feb. 14; other board members will work on that draft in the following weeks. It will include a description of this year's work in defining the values underlying the goals accepted last year, and the board's work in reaching out to the community to further refine and narrow the goals and to begin to focus on implementation areas. It will also include a description of the work to be done by the board preparatory to town meeting 1995.

Next, the board discussed the P.A.'s report, which answers the second and third of the Fincom's questions. In it, Bayne apportions her time into the categories requested, details the board's fee structure for special permits as well as subdivisions, and provides a schedule of hours she might spend reviewing a typical subdivision. The board recognized, however, that although the P.A. has been told a preliminary plan is coming in, it is utterly impossible to predict with certainty whether it will be this year or next, or whether it will be "typical" or not. Board members will remind the Fincom that it is their understanding that construction review of Ice Pond and Tall Pines (if it begins construction next year) cannot be covered by a 53G account.

Priorities for the P.A.'s time: The P.A. asked board members to spend some time considering their priorities for the tasks which she has been assigned, as her hours spent on regulatory work have been longer than either the board or she had expected. Bayne submitted a list of revisions to subdivision and special permit rules and regs, and a time line laying out the process required (and recommended) for zoning bylaw changes. She also submitted a list of press releases which, in her opinion, should be submitted to The Mosquito in order to educate people about the two major warrant articles the board has decided to submit, namely, the Master Plan report and a senior housing bylaw. She stated that she has assumed she is to write the senior housing bylaw. Some members felt the board would be merely reviewing and potentially supporting a bylaw proposed by senior housing advocates within the town; Bayne will talk with Stewart before the meeting of the 14th to determine if his group will propose a bylaw. She pointed out that while a "cluster +" bylaw might meet the needs of the financially able seniors, a different bylaw would most likely be needed to meet the requirements of those who have less. She mentioned that the Appeals Board has a set of standards for comprehensive permits which might provide the answer for the latter group. The members discussed whether they would support the development of a senior housing bylaw if there is not a strong enough advocacy group to produce a bylaw. Members agreed to discuss this further on the 14th, when they have had time to read Duscha's report on the Community Day survey results.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30.

Sandy Bayne, Planner Assistant



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of PLANNING BOARD P.O. Box 729 Ph. 369-9702 Fax 369-4521

CARLISLE EDUCATION CENTER 872 WESTFORD ST.

Feb. 7,1994

Proposed standards for siting town hall

These are not ranked

- 1. Proximity to town center
- 2. Visibility
- 3. Aesthetics: enhancement and preservation of the traditional town center
- 4. Impact on residential neighborhood
- 5. Circulation: Adequacy of on-site accessability for vehicles and pedestrians (parking, A. D. A. requirements)
- 6. Septic adequacy
- 7. Interior of building: ability of structure to provide, in present and future separate office space for staff; space for simultaneous meetings day and night for staff, boards and committees, and and community groups; dry safe storage space for records.
- 8. Acceptable cost, both initial and maintenance.